

Appn. No. 09/882,098  
Amendment dated December 15, 2004  
Reply to Office Action mailed September 15, 2004

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 through 24 remain in this application. No claims have been cancelled. Claims 25 through 40 have been withdrawn. No claims have been added.

Paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Office Action

The election of Group I, directed to a system for network resource allocation, is hereby affirmed.

Paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Office Action

Claims 1 through 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniels-Barnes et al. U.S. 6,665,705 (hereinafter referred to simply as "Daniels") in view of Bereiter U.S. 5,875,306.

In the text of the rejection of claim 1 in the Office Action, it is stated that:

As to claim 1, Daniels teaches. . . . broadcasting to the network a request to become the gateway from one of the computing devices capable of connecting to the internet, wherein the request to become the gateway includes the connection priority of the computing device broadcasting the request (see abstract, Daniels disclose...priorities assigned to the proxies...the secondary proxy is then allowed to multi-cast a message to clients indicating the secondary proxy's location...)

Considering the requirements of claim 1 in more depth, it is noted that claim 1 requires, in part, "broadcasting to the network a request to become the gateway from one of the computing devices capable of connecting to the Internet". As seen in the portion of the Office Action quoted above, it is asserted that this requirement of the applicant's invention is taught in the abstract of the Daniels patent.

Appln. No. 09/882,098  
Amendment dated December 15, 2004  
Reply to Office Action mailed September 15, 2004

Looking closer at the Abstract of Daniels, it is stated in the initial portion of the Daniels patent that (emphasis added):

A method and apparatus in a distributed data processing system for providing proxy services. Requests are processed by a primary proxy, using a shared memory in the distributed data processing system. A challenge from a secondary proxy to the primary proxy is detected.

This statement in the Abstract of Daniels lacks any indication that a request is "broadcast[] to the network" as required by the language of claim 1, and clearly leads one of ordinary skill in the art to believe that the request by the secondary proxy is directed to the primary proxy, and not to any other proxy or device. This interpretation is further supported by the "Detailed Description" of the Daniels patent, which indicates at col. 6, lines 6 through 11 that:

APPES 306 when located in the current proxy is responsible for responding to challenges by aproxies attempting to join the UPnP network. This service is responsible for employing a proxy election algorithm when aproxies come online and resolving proxy priorities.

and at col. 8, lines 10 through 11:

The process begins with a first server issuing a primary proxy challenge (step 500).

and further at col. 8, line 28:

The proxy receives and processes requests (step 508).

and also at col. 8, lines 61 through 63:

The process begins by identifying the challenge from the aproxy (step 700). This identification includes identifying the priority and USN of the aproxy.

Nothing in these descriptions of the challenge by an "aproxy" to the current proxy in the Daniels system teaches or suggests that the challenge from the aproxy to the current proxy is "broadcast" or received by other "aproxies" on the Daniels system. As the "aproxy"

Appln. No. 09/882,098  
Amendment dated December 15, 2004  
Reply to Office Action mailed September 15, 2004

in the Daniels system is aware of the identity of the current proxy through the "heartbeat" that is "multicast". Further, since the heartbeat includes the identity of the current proxy, there is no need for the aproxy to "broadcast[...] . . . a request to become the gateway", as the aproxy knows the identity of the current proxy and therefore knows where to direct the request. This procedure in Daniels is in contrast to one illustrative situation addressed by the claimed invention, in which the previous gateway has been lost or is otherwise unavailable to act as the gateway, and thus it is most likely unable to receive and resolve such requests.

The remainder portion of the Abstract of the Daniels patent states that:

A determination is made as to whether the secondary proxy has priority over the primary proxy. This may be determined using priorities assigned to the proxies. Responsive to determining whether the secondary proxy has priority over the primary proxy, a priority of the secondary proxy is stored. Responsive to the secondary proxy having priority over the primary proxy, the secondary proxy to is allowed access the shared memory. Further, the secondary proxy is then allowed to multi-cast a message to clients indicating the secondary proxy's location. This message indicates that the secondary proxy is now the primary proxy.

It is noted that this portion of the Abstract of the Daniels patent also lacks any description of the broadcasting of requests, and is not inconsistent with the interpretation that an "aproxy" directs its request to the current proxy without broadcasting the request to other "proxies".

Further, with respect to Figure 9 of Daniels and the accompanying description, it is noted that nothing in the description indicates that there is any "broadcast[...] . . . [of] a request". In

Appln. No. 09/882,098  
Amendment dated December 15, 2004  
Reply to Office Action mailed September 15, 2004

particular, the Daniels patent at col. 9, lines 41 through 52 (emphasis added):

With reference next to FIG. 9, a flowchart of a process for resolving a proxy failure is depicted in accordance with a preferred embodiment of the present invention. The process begins by updating the precedence vector (step 900). In this example, the precedence vector is updated to remove the failed proxy. Alternatively an indication may be made in the vector that the proxy has failed. Next, the proxy with the highest priority in the proxy precedence vector is identified (step 902). This identified proxy is set or designated as the new proxy (step 904), and the new proxy is unblocked from the monitor (step 906) with the process terminating thereafter.

This description of the proxy failure process lacks any indication that there is *any* broadcast of requests by computing devices, as it merely indicates that “*the proxy with the highest priority in the proxy precedence vector is identified*”, but does not provide any further detail as to how that “*proxy*” with the highest priority is identified.

It is therefore submitted that, in view of the above, the Daniels patent does not teach or suggest the requirement of “broadcasting to the network a request to become the gateway from one of the computing devices capable of connecting to the Internet” of claim 1.

Claim 1 further requires that “*the request to become the gateway includes the connection priority of the computing device broadcasting the request*”. In contrast to this requirement of claim 1, the Daniels patent discusses a proxy precedence vector that is resident in a network cache, which is used to resolve the relative priorities of the proxies. See, for example, the Daniels patent at col. 6, lines 33 through 45 (emphasis added):

Proxy precedence vector 406 represents the aggregation of each proxies respective priority. Primary APPS 306 in FIG. 3 generates a unique proxy rank for registered proxies, and updates cached proxy precedence vector 406 to reflect the relative

Appln. No. 09/882,098  
Amendment dated December 15, 2004  
Reply to Office Action mailed September 15, 2004

priority of the registered proxies. Proxy precedence vector 406 alleviates the need for further proxy challenges by maintaining a logical representation of proxy precedence. APPES 306 in FIG. 3 persists proxy precedence vector 406 in network cache 400, as opposed to a local cache, to circumvent a single point of failure condition, when the primary proxy fails.

Thus, a request from an proxy lacks the priority of the proxy, as the priorities of the proxies are maintained in the proxy precedence vector of the network cache, and not in any "local cache" that may be at the individual proxies. Turning again to the description in Daniels patent regarding Figure 9 of that patent, it is noted that at col. 9, lines 41 through 52 (emphasis added):

With reference next to FIG. 9, a flowchart of a process for resolving a proxy failure is depicted in accordance with a preferred embodiment of the present invention. The process begins by updating the precedence vector (step 900). In this example, the precedence vector is updated to remove the failed proxy. Alternatively an indication may be made in the vector that the proxy has failed. Next, the proxy with the highest priority in the proxy precedence vector is identified (step 902). This identified proxy is set or designated as the new proxy (step 904), and the new proxy is unblocked from the monitor (step 906) with the process terminating thereafter.

Thus, not only is it apparent from the Daniels disclosure that there is no broadcasting of requests, it is also clear that the request that is sent by an proxy to the current proxy lacks the priority of the proxy as the priorities are maintained in a proxy precedence vector on a central network cache.

It is therefore also submitted that, in view of the above, the Daniels patent does not teach or suggest the requirement that "the request to become the gateway includes the connection priority of the computing device broadcasting the request" of claim 1.

Appln. No. 09/882,098  
Amendment dated December 15, 2004  
Reply to Office Action mailed September 15, 2004

In the rejection in the Office Action of claim 1, it is conceded that:

Daniels fails to teach assigning the computing device broadcasting the request as the gateway for the network if the computing device broadcasting the request does not receive a response from the other computing devices within a predetermined time period.

but it is then contended in the Office Action that:

Bereiter teaches reconfiguring computer resources in a distributed computer enterprise environment. Bereiter teaches if the computing device broadcasting the request does not receive a response from the other computing devices within a predetermined time period (column 12, lines 20-32, Bereiter discloses determining whether an endpoint machine can establish communication with a first gateway machine upon a predetermined occurrence...).

Initially, it is noted that claim 1 requires "assigning the computing device broadcasting the request as the gateway for the network if the computing device broadcasting the request does not receive a response from the other computing devices within a predetermined time period". As noted above in the discussion of the Daniels patent, Daniels does not disclose the "broadcasting" of a request as asserted in the Office Action.

Further, it is also pointed out that the referenced portion of the Bereiter patent does not deal with an element that is capable of acting as a "gateway", but instead discusses an "endpoint machine" that requires a "gateway machine to communicate with a larger network. In particular, the Bereiter patent at col. 12, lines 20 through 32 states:

determining whether an endpoint machine can establish communication with a first gateway machine upon a predetermined occurrence;  
if the endpoint machine can establish communication with the first gateway machine upon the predetermined occurrence,

Appn. No. 09/882,098  
Amendment dated December 15, 2004  
Reply to Office Action mailed September 15, 2004

connecting the endpoint machine to the first gateway machine;  
if the endpoint machine cannot establish communication with the first gateway machine upon the predetermined occurrence, having the endpoint machine broadcast a boot request with an extension unique to the management server;

The referenced portion of the Bereiter patent appears to indicate that an endpoint machine attempts to establish communication with a gateway, and if it is unsuccessful in that attempt, the endpoint machine "broadcast[s] a boot request" to a "management server". However, it is noted that the endpoint machine described in the Bereiter patent would never be able to function as a "gateway for the network" as required by the language of claim 1, as the endpoint machine lacks any connection with a larger network. In contrast, the "management server" of the system described in the Bereiter patent merely locates another "gateway machine" for the endpoint computer to use to connect to the larger network. Note the description in the Bereiter patent of the endpoint computer at col. 6, lines 49 through 56 (emphasis added):

An endpoint preferably communicates only with its gateway.  
Requiring all endpoint communication to pass through a single gateway greatly simplifies connectivity issues. After a successful login, both endpoint and gateway know a working address by which to address one another. If a DHCP address lease expires, or anything changes in the network topology, then the next endpoint login will establish the new endpoint to gateway addresses.

Thus, in the Bereiter system, the endpoint computer seeking to communicate with the larger network is unable to become a "gateway" to the larger network, and thus it is submitted that the Bereiter patent could not lead one of ordinary skill in the art to the requirement of claim 1 that "the computing device broadcasting the request" is assigned "as the gateway for the network".

Appln. No. 09/882,098  
Amendment dated December 15, 2004  
Reply to Office Action mailed September 15, 2004

It is therefore submitted that neither the Daniels patent nor the Bereiter patent teaches nor suggests the requirement of "assigning the computing device broadcasting the request as the gateway for the network if the computing device broadcasting the request does not receive a response from the other computing devices within a predetermined time period" of claim 1.

Claim 11 includes similar requirements to those discussed above, and therefore for the reasons set forth above, claim 11 is also submitted to be patentable over the Daniels and Bereiter patents.

With respect to claim 16, which requires "broadcasting to the network a request to become the gateway from the respective computing device within the predetermined time period, wherein the request to become the gateway includes the connection priority of the respective computing device" and "assigning the respective computing device as the new gateway for the network if the respective computing device receives no response from the other computing devices within the predetermined time period", it is believed that the remarks set forth above show that the Daniels and Bereiter patents, either alone or in combination, do not teach these requirements. Claim 21 includes similar requirements, and is also submitted to be allowable over the cited patents.

Withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claims 1 through 24 is therefore respectfully requested.

Appln. No. 09/882,098  
Amendment dated December 15, 2004  
Reply to Office Action mailed September 15, 2004

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

LEONARD & PROEHL, Prof. L.L.C.

By J. Proehl Date: Dec. 15, 2004  
Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)  
LEONARD & PROEHL, Prof. L.L.C.  
3500 South First Avenue Circle, Suite 250  
Sioux Falls, SD 57105-5807  
(605)339-2028 FAX (605)336-1931